



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,108	11/30/2001	Harry Lee Crisp III	0112807-017	5749

24573 7590 09/15/2003
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLC
PO BOX 1135
CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135

EXAMINER

FISCHETTI, JOSEPH A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3627	

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SW

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/010,108	CRISP, HARRY LEE
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Joseph A. Fischetti	3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Applicant's election with traverse of restriction requirement in Paper No. 8 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that all claims are drawn to a drink supply canister. This is not found persuasive because the additional limitations of a seal and displaceable valve in claim 18 and 22 cause these claims to be separate and distinct from the invention of claim 1.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 12, no antecedent basis exists for body means in line 6. Claims 14, 16, 17 valves are misspelled.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bennett et al.

Re claims 1 and 12: Bennett et al disclose: a body 12, a gas inlet valve 32, an outlet valve 34.

Re claim 2: valve 32 is read as a tilt valve because of the quick disconnect feature which would allow the valve to be disconnected while being tilted.

Re claim 3: valve 32 is read as a rotatable valve because the valve can be rotated when disconnecting.

Re claims 4 and 5: both valves 32, 34 are threadedly attached and thus are removably attached.

Re claims 6 and 7: the narrow screw-in bases of valves 32, 34 with the oversized top portions cause an umbrella shape.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 10, 11, 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardwick et al in view of Kane et al.

Hardwick et al. disclose an inlet valve 111 and an outlet valve 110 connected to a body 102 in a side-by-side manner. Kane et al. discloses an inlet and an outlet at opposite ends of a canister 1. It would obvious to modify Hardwick to include an end to

end arrangement of the valves in Hardwick et al because this would save on tubing so as not to require excessive routing of tubing to side-by-side valves.

Regarding, the type of valve used, it is deemed to be a matter of design choice whether an umbrella valve or tilt valve is used. Official Notice is taken regarding the old and obvious use of a grommet.

Claims 1, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardwick et al. in view of Novitsky substantially as claimed as set forth above. However, Hardwick et al. fails to disclose a piercable sealing member, but Novitsky does disclose such a member 36. It would be obvious to modify Hardwick et al to include such a piercable member at valve(s) 110 or 116 because this would allow a reduction of parts.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Joseph A. Fischetti at telephone number (703) 305-0731.

J. F.
Piping Exam
3627

Fischetti/kn
August 28, 2003